UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,321	04/19/2006	Kazunari Kurita	12054-0059	9391
22902 CLARK & BRO	7590 07/23/200 ODY	EXAMINER		
1090 VERMON	NT AVENUE, NW	KUNEMUND, ROBERT M		
SUITE 250 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Comments	10/576,321	KURITA ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Robert M. Kunemund	1792		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/20 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection is objected to be a specification to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection is objected to be a specific and the second drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct than the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	er. cepted or b) objected to by the led drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). iected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xammer. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-132.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/09.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte		

The finality of the last Office Action as been withdrawn.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (EP 1,087,041) in view of IKari (JP 2000-344,598) and Tobe (2004/0102056).

The Abe reference teaches a method of producing a high-resistance silicon wafer having a resistivity of 100 cm or more, oxygen concentration of 14x1017 atoms/cm³ or more remaining oxygen concentration of 12x10⁻⁷ atoms/cm³ or less by performing heat treatment performed at 700-900°C for 5 hours or more, a heat treatment performed at 950-1050°C for 10 hours or more,

Page 3

a heat treatment performed at 1100-1250°C for 1-5 hours, and a density of a grown-in defect of lx103/cm³. The difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the carbon concentration and third annealing step. However, the Ikari reference teaches the claimed carbon concentrations in silicon wafer grown by czochralski, Note translted abs. The Tobe reference teaches a third annealing step after the high temperature annealing, note page 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the Abe reference by the teachings of the Ikari and Tobe references to have a set carbon concentration and third annealing in order to create the desired properties in the final silicon wafer.

Claims 6 to 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe (EP 1,087,041) in view of IKari (JP 2000-344,598) and Tobe (2004/0102056).

The Abe, Ikari and Tobe references are relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differ from the instant claims in the materials deposited onto the silicon wafers. However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentations the optimum, operable after growth in the combined prior art in order to grow a specific device.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 to 8 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Kornakov can be reached on 571-272-1303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert M Kunemund Primary Examiner Art Unit 1792

RMK

/Robert M Kunemund/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792